PART IV - SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART IV - SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M1.0 SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) will use a Three Phase source selection process. Advancement through the process will be based on an evaluation of all factors in relation to the stated evaluation criteria. Offerors who do not proceed beyond Phase I, as a result of the evaluation proceedings are not eligible to participate in Phase II and Phase III of this source selection process.

M2.0 BASIS FOR AWARD

M2.1 Award Selection

This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with the FAA Acquisition Management System (AMS). Award will be made to the Offeror whose proposal is judged to represent the best value to the Government. Best value will be based on an evaluation of all factors in relation to the stated evaluation criteria and will be determined by evaluating each proposal in four areas: Technical, Management, Past Performance, and Cost/Price. Offerors will receive a score for Technical, Management and Past Performance. The Technical, Management and Past Performance areas' scores will be derived from evaluation of the Offer for the Factors and Subfactors defined for each area. For the Price area, the total price and reasonableness of each price will be considered. Offerors' scores for Technical, Management and Past Performance areas, and Cost/Price considerations will be used in support of the Best Value determination. The Source Selection Official (SSO) will use the integration of the final evaluations of these areas to arrive at a Best Value decision. **Therefore, the successful Offeror may not have submitted the lowest price.** The Government intends to select one contactor for the AFSSVS program. However, the Government reserves the right to make no award at all, depending on the quality of the proposals

M2.2 Downselect Decisions

The FAA reserves the right to make downselect decisions prior to an award decision. These decisions will be made after receipt and evaluation of responses to individual Screening Information Requests (SIRs). Each downselect decision will be based upon identification of those Offerors deemed to be most likely to receive the award.

If at any point during the evaluation process, the FAA concludes that the Offeror does not have a reasonable chance of receiving this award, the FAA may eliminate the Offeror from further consideration for award. Any Offeror eliminated from further consideration will be officially notified in writing.

M2.3 Evaluation Order of Importance

Technical is significantly more important than Management and Management is more important than Past Performance. Cost/Price is the least important area. However, as Technical, Management and Past Performance scores become closer between Offerors, Cost/Price will become more important.

PART IV - SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M2.4 Eligibility for Award

The Offeror must be financially viable and otherwise responsible in accordance with the FAA AMS. To be eligible for award, the contractor must be technically and financially capable of performing the work.

In evaluating the proposals, the Government may conduct written or oral communications with any and/or all Offerors. Additionally, the FAA reserves the right to conduct discussions and negotiations with any individual competing Offeror, or all competing Offerors, as the situation warrants. Discussions with one or more Offerors do not require discussions with all Offerors.

M2.5 Award on Initial Offers

The FAA reserves the right to award a contract immediately following the conclusion of the evaluation of the initial offer, without discussions or negotiations. Therefore, it is critical that each proposal be fully responsive to this solicitation and its provisions.

M2.6 Multiple Awards

While a single award is anticipated under this acquisition, the Government may make multiple awards if that is deemed in the best interest of the FAA.

M2.7 Best and Final Offer (BAFO)

The Government reserves the right to conduct a BAFO.

M3.0 EVALUATION PROCESS

M3.1 Phase I

The Offeror's Phase I submittal will be evaluated based on the Offeror's proposed approach, understanding of the requirements and the proposed product's feasibility to meet the need. Based on this assessment, an adjectival rating will be derived for each of the factors specified below. Each factor will be rated as delineated in paragraph M4.0. An overall adjectival rating will be given to the Phase I submittal based on resulting factor evaluations. Judgment will be applied in the evaluation to derive the overall rating.

M3.1.1 Evaluation Factors (Areas of Interest for Phase I)

- **Architecture –** Degree to which the Offeror's voice switch architecture has the potential to meet the AFSSVS technical requirements as stated in the AFSSVS specification.
- **Operations –** Degree to which the capabilities and attributes of the Offeror's voice switch have the potential to meet the AFSSVS operational requirements.
- **Trunk and Radio Interface –** Degree to which the Offeror's voice switch capacity can accommodate trunks and radios.
- **Computer Human Interface –** Degree to which the display screens available with the Offeror's product have the potential to meet FAA computer human interface design considerations.

PART IV - SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

- **Information Security –** Degree to which the inherent security features available with the Offeror's product meet FAA requirements outlined in the specification and assures security integrity.
- **Telecommunications Offloading –** Degree to which the Offeror's design approach has the potential to achieve a/g and g/g call transfer/offloading between AFSS facilities.
- **Life Cycle Support Services –** Degree to which the Offeror's approach to support the proposed product throughout the life of the contract assures a successful support capability.
- **Management Organization, Production and Installation –** Degree to which the Offeror's management organization has the potential to successfully manage all facets of the program. Degree to which the Offeror's production capability, capacity, and approach to installing the proposed product have the potential to satisfy the installation schedule outlined in Section F.
- **Test and Evaluation –** Degree to which the Offeror's approach to support Software Integration, Formal Qualification Test (FQT), Production Acceptance and Site Acceptance testing has the potential to satisfy SOW requirements.
- **Record of Sales –** Degree to which the Offeror's product sales indicate maturity in the marketplace.

M3.1.2 Factor Priorities (For Phase I)

The factors above are classified in importance as shown with all factor(s) being equal within their respective categories.

(A) Most Important	(B) Medium Importance	(C) Important
- Architecture	- Life Cycle Support Services	- Record of Sales
- Operations	- Management Organization, Production and Installation	
- Trunk and Radio Interface		
- Computer Human Interface	- Test and Evaluation	
- Information Security		
- Telecommunications Offloading		

The factors listed in column A are more important than the factors listed in column B. The factors listed in column B are more important than the factor listed in column C.

M3.2 Phase II – Technical, Management & Operational Capability Assessment

The Offeror's Phase II submittal will be evaluated based on the Offeror's proposed approach, understanding of the requirements and the proposed product's feasibility to meet the needs of the Government. Based on this assessment, an adjectival rating will be derived for each of the factors specified below. Each factor will be rated as delineated in paragraph M4. An overall adjectival rating will be given to the Phase II submittal based on resulting factor evaluations. Judgment will be applied in the evaluation to derive the overall rating.

PART IV - SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The Operational Capability Assessment (OCA) will be used as additional data to clarify, substantiate, and validate information provided in Volumes I and II. Although not rated separately, it is integral to the overall evaluation of the Volume I and II factors.

Offerors are reminded that the information included in their proposals, Operational Capability Assessment and formal discussions will be the basis for the evaluation and Offerors should consider the evaluation factors in this section very carefully in preparing their responses.

M3.2.1 Volume I - Technical Volume – Evaluation Factors

The Factor Priorities for Phase II are the same as for Phase I. The "Record of Sales" Factor is not included in Phase II. The factors are classified in importance as shown with all factor(s) being equal within their respective categories

(A)	**(B)**
Most Important	**Medium Importance**
- Architecture	- Life Cycle Support Services
- Operations	- Management Organization, Production and Installation
- Trunk and Radio Interface	
- Computer Human Interface	- Test and Evaluation
- Information Security	
- Telecommunications Offloading	

The factors listed in column A are more important than the factors listed in column B.

M3.2.1.1 Factor 1 - AFSS Voice Switch Architecture

Element 1 - Baseline Architecture - Degree to which the Offeror's technical architecture meets the AFSSVS functional and performance requirements described in the specification. Degree to which the architecture is "in place". If the existing architecture does not meet all functional and performance requirements, the degree of the effort involved to modify the Offeror's architecture in order to meet those requirements the architecture does not currently satisfy. Degree to which the commonality of elements used within the system benefits the Government.

Element 2 – Scalability - Degree to which the Offeror's proposed architecture provides modular and scalable attributes. Degree to which the Offeror's proposed architecture allows for ease of expansion.

Element 3 – Maximum Capacity - Degree to which the Offeror's proposed architecture accommodates the maximums identified in the specification, i.e., frequencies, trunks, and positions.

Element 4 – Clustering - Degree to which the Offeror's proposed architecture can accommodate clustering, i.e., perform call transfer between a receiving AFSS facility and up to two other AFSS facilities.

PART IV - SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Element 5 - Commercial Standards - Degree to which the Offeror's proposed product uses commercial/industry standards rather than proprietary standards.

Element 6 – Hardware Redundancy - Degree to which hardware redundancy exists in the Offeror's proposed architecture that reduces/eliminates single points of failure.

Element 7 –Technology Insertion - Degree to which the Offeror's architecture can accommodate technology insertion.

Element 8 -Risk Identification and Mitigation - Degree to which the Offeror identifies areas of architecture risk and provides an acceptable mitigation approach for all areas.

M3.2.1.2 Importance of Factor 1 Elements by Priority

All elements within this factor are of equal priority for evaluation purposes.

M3.2.1.3 Factor 2 - AFSS Voice Switch Operations

Element 1 – Concept of Use - Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an understanding of the AFSS operating environment and degree to which its proposed voice switch supports the AFSSVS Concept of Use.

Element 2 – Offloading Capability - Degree to which the Offeror's operational approach to meet the FAA requirement achieves transfer of air/ground calls from one AFSS facility to other AFSS facilities, during periods of low demand for flight services.

Element 3 – ACD - Degree to which the Offeror's approach meets the Automated Call Directory (ACD) requirements.

Element 4 - Facility Power and Space - Degree to which the Offeror's approach meets FAA facility power and space constraints as defined in the SOW.

Element 5 – Remote Maintenance Monitoring Control – Degree to which the Offeror's approach meets the Remote Maintenance Monitoring Control requirements.

M3.2.1.4 Importance of Factor 2 Elements by Priority

All elements within this factor are of equal priority for evaluation purposes.

M3.2.1.5 Factor 3 - Trunk and Radio Interface

Element 1 – Trunk Compatibility - Degree to which the Offeror's proposed voice switch accommodates the trunk requirements outlined in the specification.

Element 2 – Radio Compatibility - Degree to which the Offeror's proposed voice switch accommodates the radio requirements outlined in the specification.

□

PART IV - SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Element 3 – Common Interfaces – Degree to which common interfaces are used to meet the radio and trunk interface requirements

M3.2.1.6 Importance of Factor 3 Elements by Priority

All elements within this factor are of equal priority for evaluation purposes.

M3.2.1.7 Factor 4 - Computer Human Interface

Element 1 – Requirements Compliance - Degree to which the Offeror's approach meets the computer human interface factor requirements contained in the specification.

Element 2. – Design Flexibility - Degree to which the Offeror's computer human interfaces can accommodate design changes.

M3.2.1.8 Importance of Factor 4 Elements by Priority

All elements within this factor are of equal priority for evaluation purposes.

M3.2.1.9 Factor 5 - Information Security

Element 1 – Capabilities and Features - Degree to which the information security capabilities and features of the Offeror's proposed product meet FAA requirements.

Element 2 – Offloading and RMMC - Degree to which the Offeror's approach adheres to the information security requirements outlined in the specification while providing "offloading" and Remote Maintenance Monitoring Control(RMMC) capabilities.

M3.2.1.10 Importance of Factor 5 Elements by Priority

All elements within this factor are of equal priority for evaluation purposes.

M3.2.1.11 Factor 6 - Telecommunications for Offloading Interface

Element 1 - Telecommunications Interface - Degree to which the Offeror's voice switch Offloading architecture is able to interface with FAA telecommunications services as provided by the FAA Telecommunications Infrastructure (FTI) program and/or proposed by the Offeror as an alternate service.

Element 2 – Compatibility - Degree to which the Offeror's voice switch will ensure compatibility with the changing telecommunications environment, i.e., fiber, internet and satellite.

PART IV - SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M3.2.1.12 Importance of Factor 6 Elements by Priority

All elements within this factor are of equal priority for evaluation purposes.

M3.2.1.13 Factor 7 - Life Cycle Support Services

Element 1 – CRS - Degree to which the Offeror's approach and effort involved to achieve a Contractor Repair Service (CRS) program and provide life cycle maintenance support that meets FAA requirements.

Element 2 – RMA - Degree to which the Offeror's reliability, availability and maintainability attributes of its proposed voice switch meet FAA requirements. Degree of automated built-in diagnostics and their advantages. Degree and availability of features, which enhance fault detection, reporting and failure tracking mechanisms.

Element 3 – Training - Degree to which the Offeror's approach to develop FAA training courses meets the FAA requirements. Degree to which the Offeror's approach satisfies the training simulator requirement.

M3.2.1.14 Importance of Factor 7 Elements by Priority

All elements within this factor are of equal priority for evaluation purposes.

M3.2.1.15 Factor 8 – Management Organization, Production and Installation

Element 1 – Organization – Degree to which the Offeror's management organization is aligned and structured to successfully execute the AFSSVS program.

Element 2 – Schedule - Degree to which the Offeror's production capacity has the potential to produce the quantities sufficient to satisfy the schedule specified in Section F. Degree to which the Offeror has appropriate production methods, planning and execution to include an appropriate organizational structure.

Element 3 – Installation - Degree to which the Offeror's installation capability can satisfy the quantities specified in Section F. Degree to which the Offeror has an appropriate organizational structure and processes to execute the required installations.

M3.2.1.16 Importance of Factor 8 Elements by Priority

All elements within this factor are of equal priority for evaluation purposes.

M3.2.1.17 Factor 9 – Test and Evaluation

Element 1 - Test Validation – Degree to which the Offeror's approach meets the Test and Evaluation requirements outlined in the SOW, specifically, Software Integration Test, Formal Qualification Test, Site Acceptance Test and Production Acceptance Test

PART IV - SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Element 2 – Test Verification – Degree to which the Offeror approach has the potential to support FAA test activities, specifically, Operational Test and Evaluation (OT&E), OT&E Regression, Engineering Change Proposal upgrades and Field Familiarization.

M3.2.1.18 Importance of Factor 9 Elements by Priority

All elements within this factor are of equal priority for evaluation purposes.

M3.2.2 Volume II – Management - Evaluation Factors

M3.2.2.1 Factor M1 - Program Management

Element 1 – Work Management – Degree to which the full range of effort defined in the SOW is sufficiently allocated and managed.

Element 2 – Program Management Organization - Degree to which the Program Manager's reporting chain within the organizational structure ensures the appropriate access to upper management. Degree to which the Program Manager's authority affords access to resources to accomplish the effort. Degree to which the organizational structure supports the work to be accomplished (engineering, production, installation).

Element 3 - Key Personnel - Degree to which the qualification statements for key technical and management personnel meet the performance requirements of the contract.

Element 4 – Cost, Schedule and Technical Oversight - Degree to which the Offeror's management approach toward cost, schedule and technical performance has the potential to ensure a successful program.

Element 5 – Partnership – Degree to which the Offeror's approach to achieve partnering ensures effective and efficient interaction with the FAA Product Team staff.

Element 6 – Production Control – Degree to which the Offeror's management approach has the potential to satisfy the AFSSVS production processes, quantities and delivery schedule.

M3.2.2.2 Importance of Factor M1 Elements by Priority

The factor elements above are considered equally important in priority for evaluation purposes. Within Volume II, Factor M1 is more important than Factor M2.

PART IV - SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M3.2.2.3 Factor M2 - Subcontracting Plan

The Subcontracting Plan will be evaluated based on the Offeror's demonstrated commitment to assuring that small, small disadvantaged and women-owned small business concerns are provided the maximum practicable opportunity to participate in the AFSSVS program. The evaluation will consider the plausibility that the subcontracting goals can be achieved.

M3.2.2.4 Importance of Factor M2

Within Volume II, Factor M2 is considered less important than Factor M1. However, note that the Subcontracting Plan will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis. Failure to submit an acceptable subcontracting plan and/or correct deficiencies with the time specified by the Contracting Officer may make an Offeror ineligible for award.

M3.2.3 Volume III - Past Performance – Evaluation Factor

Past Performance is evaluated from the information requested in Section L.16.1 together with information that may be provided on the past performance questionnaire (Section L.16.0, Attachment L.3). Past Performance information will be gathered within the FAA, from other Government agencies, and from non-government organizations.

The offeror's record of past performance must show no deficiencies in performance within the last 3 years that would increase the risk of failure in performance of the AFSSVS contract. A past performance deficiency that occurred outside of the 3 year period, but has not yet been resolved, will be counted as a current deficiency. The FAA will not hold the offeror responsible for failures or deficiencies that were beyond the offeror's control. The Government reserves the right to make inquiries as to the prospective offeror's past performance on any existing or previous contracts, regardless of whether or not they are included in the proposal submission. The following specific criteria, which are of equal weight, will be used to evaluate past performance:

Element 1 -Technical Performance -- Considers the offeror's compliance with technical requirements and performance standards, for previous and present work. The offeror's compliance with process requirements and performance requirements as well as the quality of the service or support will be considered. The offeror's performance on interim work and deliverables such as system designs, prototype hardware, and technical reports will be considered. The initiative of the offeror in identifying and resolving unforeseen technical problems will also be evaluated.

Element 2 - Schedule Performance -- Considers how well the offeror has met completion dates. This includes any interim deliverables or milestones and completion of valid customer direction.

Element 3 - Cost Performance -- Considers cost increases and cost savings, examples of which may be cost overruns and/or cost underruns experienced on previous and current contracts. Only those increases or savings within the responsibility of the offeror under the terms of the particular contracts will be considered. However, customer directed efforts and "descopings" to

mitigate costs increases will be considered in assessing cost performance. Cost performance also considers the adequacy of the contractors' accounting system and controls.

M3.3 Phase III – Final Evaluation/Selection Evaluation

M3.3.1 Operational Capability Testing

The Operational Capability Test (OCT) will place two (2) of the offeror's proposed voice switches into an operational environment to assess their suitability and functionality. Test results will be used to further discern any technical strengths and weaknesses identified during the evaluation process. Test results will also provide a basis for appraising the scope and feasibility of developmental efforts or enhancements addressed in the offeror's written proposal. Also, any areas of risk identified in the evaluation process will be appraised for their potential impact to areas of technical, cost and schedule.

M3.3.2 Volume IV - Cost/Price - Assessment

The cost assessment will be based on the total price for all base and option period items with consideration for the following:
a. AFSSVS System prices shall be proposed based on the configurations listed at Attachment F.1.
b. CLIN 0002 price will be assessed for 5 systems in the identified configurations listed at Attachment F.1
c. CLIN 4001 price will be assessed for the same 21 systems corresponding to CLIN 3001 in the identified configurations listed at Attachment F.1.

The base and option periods will be added together to establish the Offeror's total proposed prices for evaluation. The Government may use cost/price analysis to evaluate the cost estimates or prices, not only to determine whether or not they are reasonable, but also to determine the Offeror's understanding of the work and the Offeror's ability to perform the contract. The price for all base and option years will be evaluated for:

1. Reasonableness -- Acceptability of the cost or price estimating methodology--review of rationale and supporting data for proposed costs.

2. Completeness -- Responsiveness in addressing all SIR requirements--review of the proposal to ensure data provided is sufficient to allow a complete analysis and evaluation of the costs or prices delineated in Section B and includes all information and exhibits required by Section L.

3. Realism -- Compatibility of the cost/price and scope of work and traceability of the estimates; assessment of the level of confidence and reliability in the estimating methodologies employed by the Offerors and whether they produce realistic proposed costs based upon the Government's requirements and contractor proposed performance.

PART IV - SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

4. Consistency/traceability -- How well the Offeror's proposed costs and prices match the labor categories and support levels proposed, the method of accomplishing the work described in the technical capabilities proposal, and the Offeror's past experience for similar work.

To assist in determining the reasonableness and realism of cost or price, evaluation of the Offeror's proposal may include verification of the rates proposed by the prime and all subcontractors. This may require a determination concerning the appropriateness of direct and indirect rates and the use of special pricing based on allowable accounting and estimating policies. Other agencies such as the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) may be called upon to assist the FAA in making this determination.

The Government may also assign a degree of risk as appropriate to each cost proposal that will result in the elimination of the Offeror's proposal if the Offeror's estimating or accounting system cannot be validated in accordance with the criteria in this section or if the proposal shows evidence of being seriously flawed.

M4.0 ADJECTIVAL RATINGS

These adjectival ratings will be utilized for Pre-Screening and Phase I evaluations.

Rating	Description
Excellent	The Offeror has addressed all aspects of the evaluation factor or element in a highly competent and logical manner. The Offeror has very extensively documented the capability to far exceed the Government's minimum requirements, leaving no doubt that the Offeror can execute this contract in a superior manner. There are virtually no weaknesses, deficiencies, or patent or latent ambiguities.
Good	The Offeror has addressed the majority of the aspects of the evaluation factor or element in a highly competent and logical manner, and the Offeror has addressed all other aspects of the evaluation factor or element in a competent and logical manner. The Offeror has documented the capability to exceed the Government's minimum requirements so that it is more probable than not that the Offeror can execute this contract at a level exceeding the Government's minimum needs. While some weaknesses, deficiencies, or patent or latent ambiguities are present, they are insignificant in nature.
Satisfactory	The Offeror has addressed all aspects of the evaluation factor or element in a competent and logical manner. The Offeror has documented the capability to meet the Government's minimum requirements so that it is more probable than not that the Offeror can execute this contract at a level meeting the Government's minimum needs. While many weaknesses, deficiencies, or patent or latent ambiguities are present, they will not seriously impact performance.
Marginal	The Offeror has addressed all aspects of the evaluation factor or element; however, the information the Offeror has provided does not demonstrate that the Offeror can fully meet the Government's minimum requirements. It is more likely than not that the Offeror cannot achieve or sustain a satisfactory performance level. The many weaknesses, deficiencies, and ambiguities present are significant, requiring workarounds so as to not seriously degrade performance.
Unsatisfactory	The Offeror has failed to address the key aspects of the evaluation factor or element. The Offeror has only repeated the language of the specification or SOW. The information the Offeror has provided leaves no doubt that the Offeror cannot meet the Government's minimum requirements.